

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 21-23 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 2-24 are pending with claim 24 having been withdrawn from consideration.

Applicant respectfully asserts that support for the amendments to claims 21-23 may be found, for example, at pages 8-11 of the Specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claims 21-23 do not introduce new matter.

Summary of Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the personal interview conducted on March 25, 2010. In accordance with MPEP §713.04, Applicant provides herewith a statement of the substance of the interview.

During the interview, discussions focused on proposed claim language to distinguish over Yamazaki and Motoyama et al. In addition, some discussion was provided regarding possible claim amendments to recite features exclusively related to electron impact dissociation to distinguish over the photodecomposition processes disclosed by Yamazaki and Motoyama et al. Accordingly, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the dedication to working together to determine acceptable claim language to distinguish over Yamazaki and Motoyama et al., and welcomes an opportunity to further discuss the invention at a later date, if necessary.

Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the present Amendment is fully commensurate with discussions provided during the personal interview, and is fully responsive to the Final Office Action.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

On pages 2 to 6 of the Final Office Action, claims 2-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 4,588,610) in view of various combinations of Motoyama et al. (JP 2002-075876), Zhang et al. ("Low Temperature...Excimer Lamp"), Ray et al. ("Diamond Like...Deposition"), Horioka et al. (US 4,595,601), and Aoyama (JP 04-146620). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 21-23, as amended, each recite a method for treating a substrate including, in part, a step of "placing an electrically conductive substrate in a treating container maintained at a pressure of 0.1 to 1 atmospheric pressure," (emphasis added). In direct contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, and as agreed upon during the personal interview, Yamazaki and Motoyama et al. both explicitly disclose photodecomposition processes using relatively low-pressure such that a substrate is placed into a reaction chamber having an upper pressure of 10 Torr. Here, Applicant respectfully asserts that the upper pressure ranges required by Yamazaki and Motoyama et al. is 0.01315 atmospheres (760 Torr = 1 atmosphere), which is

distinctly below Applicant's claimed lower pressure range of 0.1 atmospheres. Accordingly, Applicant's claimed range is clearly neither taught nor suggested by Yamazaki and/or Motoyama et al.

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the photodecomposition processes disclosed by Yamazaki and Motoyama et al. are purposely performed at relatively low pressures due to the requirements for photodecomposition to occur. Specifically, increasing the upper pressure range to significantly above the upper limit of 10 Torr would adversely change the principle operations of both Yamazaki and Motoyama et al., thereby rendering Yamazaki and Motoyama et al. inoperable for their intended uses. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Yamazaki and Motoyama et al. actually teach away from Applicant's invention.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of Zhang et al., Ray et al., Horioka et al., and Aoyama can remedy the deficiencies of Yamazaki and Motoyama et al., whether taken individually or combined. Specifically, none of Zhang et al., Ray et al., Horioka et al., and Aoyama, whether taken individually or combined, teaches changing the relatively low-pressure photodecomposition processes of Yamazaki and Motoyama et al. to relatively high-pressure electron impact dissociation processes. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of Zhang et al., Ray et al., Horioka et al., and Aoyama can remedy the deficiencies of Yamazaki and Motoyama et al., whether taken

individually or combined, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to at least independent claims 21-23, and respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 2-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

This Response is believed to be fully responsive and to place the application in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendment, and an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly requested. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Should the Examiner believe that any matters need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment

to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/David B. Hardy/

David B. Hardy, Reg. No. 47,362
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

DBH/lrs